UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/752,683 | 01/08/2004 | Hirofumi Muratani | 247273US2SRD DIV | 5927 |
| 22850 7590 08/14/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | GYORFI, THOMAS A | |
| ALEAANDRIA, VA 22514 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2135 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/14/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|--|
| 10/752,683 | MURATANI, HIROF | UMI | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Thomas Gyorfi | 2135 | | |

| | Thomas Cyem | 2100 |
|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>30 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi peal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailir | ng date of the final rejection. | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi or than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com | pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two months of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal (38 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further content (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) | onsideration and/or search (see NO | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | etter form for appeal by materially red | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) | | scied ciaims. |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. | | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | , |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate, | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile that status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 4-8.14-19 and 23-27. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | I be entered and an explanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attached. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b | ut does NOT place the application in | condition for allowance because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☑ Other: <u>Attachment: Searched Notes</u> . | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | |
| /KimYen Vu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135 | | |
| | | |

(Continuation of 7): The rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, is hereby withdrawn in view of the amended claims.

However, Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections of claims under 35 USC 101 are not persuasive. Applicant's citation of AT&T and Excel is not pertinent to the instant application because the instant specification does not disclose any sort of electrical signals, let alone a transformation of electrical signals from one form to another as was at issue in that case. Furthermore, the portions of the specification cited by the Applicant as satisfying the requirement under 37 CFR 1.83(a) all disclose "units"; however, the term "unit" is at best a "black box" that could be embodied as any manner of thing, including a software-only construct. And as has been noted in previous Actions, the only portions of the instant specification that even attempt to define what a "unit" is in the context of the instant invention, define the term as a series of bits (see page 22), thus lending support to the position that the instant invention is non-statutory,